

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA  
LAFAYETTE DIVISION**

**RAYNALDO MARKEITH SAMPY JR**

**CASE NO. 6:23-CV-00747 SEC P**

**VERSUS**

**JUDGE ROBERT R. SUMMERHAYS**

**MAVERICK MORVANT ET AL**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE CAROL B.  
WHITEHURST**

**RULING ON OBJECTION**

The present matters before the Court are the cross-motions for summary judgment filed on March 11, 2025, by the defendant, Maverick Morvant [ECF No. 74] and on March 21, 2025, by the plaintiff, Raynaldo M. Sampy, Jr. (“Sampy”) [ECF No. 79]. The Court previously dismissed all claims except Sampy’s False Arrest claim against Morvant, which is the sole remaining claim.<sup>1</sup> The present motions address that claim. The motions were referred to the Magistrate Judge, who issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the False Arrest claim be dismissed.

Sampy filed an Objection to the Report and Recommendation and offers “new evidence” that he argues creates a disputed issue of material fact sufficient to defeat summary judgement.<sup>2</sup> This new evidence is a screenshot of a portion of a text exchange allegedly between Sampy and someone identified only by a phone number and the initial “H.” Sampy contends that the text was from the general manager of The Office bar and proves that the Affidavit from Brandon Dugas is false. The text message is dated February 24th (year unknown) at 1:36 p.m. and states “I want no part in this matter this is between you and the Lafayette police department.”<sup>3</sup> The Affidavit of Brandon Dugas<sup>4</sup> states that Officer Dugas served as Security Liaison for The Office Bar and that

---

<sup>1</sup> See ECF No. 73.

<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 97.

<sup>3</sup> See ECF No. 97.

<sup>4</sup> ECF No. 37-6.

“after discussions with the general manager of The Officer [sic] Bar about a number of violent incidents downtown, including a shooting, it was decided that The Officer [sic] Bar would close at 1:30 a.m. and that patrons would be ushered away from the front of the bar in order to reduce the likelihood of a violent incident occurring on the property or involving patrons or staff of the bar”<sup>5</sup> and further that “on October 2, 2022, The Office Bar closed at 1:30 a.m.”<sup>6</sup>

Sampy now argues that this text message exchange establishes that The Office Bar did not close at 1:30 a.m. on October 2, 2022 and thus contradicts the Dugas Affidavit. Sampy contends that this disputed fact—i.e. the closing time of The Office Bar—defeats summary judgment. The Court disagrees. Nothing in Sampy’s screenshotted text contradicts Dugas’ affidavit with respect to the closing time of the bar on October 2, 2022. Specifically, the text is silent about the bar’s closing time on that date and only reflects the other party’s desire to avoid involvement in Sampy’s dispute. Nor does the timing of the text exchange support any inference about the closing time. It is time-stamped “February” and thus does not appear to be contemporaneous with the events on October 2, 2022. Furthermore, the fact that, at the time of the February text exchange, the manager of The Office bar stated to Sampy that he “wanted no part” in Sampy’s dispute with the police does not contradict the statements in Dugas’ affidavit about Dugas’ conversations with the bar manager in October 2022 and the decision to close the bar at 1:30a.m. Finally, Sampy has provided no reasonable basis why this new evidence was not submitted before the Report and Recommendation was entered as the text exchange is dated in February and Sampy claims that he “sent these messages to Michael Adley a week before he substituted counsel.”<sup>7</sup> The substitution of

---

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*, at ¶ 9.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, at ¶ 10.

<sup>7</sup> See ECF No. 97.

counsel motion was filed with the Court on April 2, 2025, long before the Report and Recommendation was entered.

In sum, the text exchange presented by Sampy does not preserve his remaining claim from summary judgment, and his Objection raises no legal arguments that were not previously addressed. Accordingly, the Objection [ECF No. 97] is OVERRULED.

THUS DONE in Chambers on this 14th day of August, 2025.



ROBERT R. SUMMERHAYS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE